

STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2011-12**New London School District**

NICHOLAS A. FISCHER, Superintendent

Location: 134 Williams Street
New London,
Connecticut

Telephone: (860) 447-6000

Website: newlondon.org/

This profile was produced by the Connecticut State Department of Education in accordance with CT General Statutes 10-220(c) using data and narratives provided by the school district, testing services, or the US Census. Profiles and additional education data, including longitudinal data, are available on the internet at www.sde.ct.gov.

COMMUNITY DATA

County: New London

Town Population in 2000: 25,671

1990-2000 Population Growth: -10.1%

Number of Public Schools: 6

Per Capita Income in 2000: \$18,437

Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000*: 19.3%

Percent of Adults Who Were Not Fluent in English in 2000*: 4.3%

District Enrollment as % of Estimated. Student Population: 89.3%

*To view the Adult Education Program Profiles online, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on Adult Education, then Reports.

District Reference Group (DRG): I DRG is a classification of districts whose students' families are similar in education, income, occupation, and need, and that have roughly similar enrollment. The Connecticut State Board of Education approved DRG classification for purposes of reporting data other than student performance.

STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Enrollment on October 1, 2011 2,961
5-Year Enrollment Change 0.5%

DISTRICT GRADE RANGE

Grade Range PK - 12

INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL NEED

Need Indicator	Number in District	Percent		
		District	DRG	State
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	2,572	86.9	83.8	35.2
K-12 Students Who Are Not Fluent in English	640	21.9	15.1	5.6
Students Identified as Gifted and/or Talented*	145	4.9	1.6	4.0
PK-12 Students Receiving Special Education Services in District	470	15.9	13.3	11.5
Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School or Headstart	99	64.3	65.9	79.8
Homeless	91	3.1	0.8	0.3
Juniors and Seniors Working 16 or More Hours Per Week	83	20.5	10.9	13.0

*81.4 % of the identified gifted and/or talented students received services.

SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSITY

Student Race/Ethnicity		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian	31	1.0
Asian American	44	1.5
Black	812	27.4
Hispanic	1,455	49.1
Pacific Islander	6	0.2
White	496	16.8
Two or more races	117	4.0
Total Minority	2,465	83.2

Percent of Minority Professional Staff: 18.2%

Non-English Home Language:

26.9% of this district's students (excluding prekindergarten students) come from homes where English is not the primary language. The number of non-English home languages is 17.

EFFORTS TO REDUCE RACIAL, ETHNIC AND ECONOMIC ISOLATION

Below is the description submitted by this school of how it provides educational opportunities for its students to interact with students and teachers from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds.

Our diverse student population continues to be one of the New London Public School's greatest strengths. Through community outreach we have successfully established venues to bring together various constituents to identify, discuss and address the needs of our students and their families. A variety of student and community focused events were held during Hope Week, which is a week dedicated to activities that underscore the message that we, as a community, stand united in our willingness and our resolve to help and support our youth. Hope Week events included the annual Art, Science and Community Partners' Fair which brings hundreds of parents, students and community members together. The NAACP also sponsored an educational symposium as part of Hope Week. Students from 18 other districts attend our Science and Technology Magnet High School. Our students are also enrolled in the following magnet or charter schools: Regional Multicultural Magnet School, The Friendship School, the Interdistrict School for Arts and Communication and the Dual Language Arts Academy. In 2011-2012, NLPS students participated in a myriad of activities with students from the surrounding school districts such as, field trips, workshops, athletic events/competitions, school-to-career and service learning programs to name a few. Students with disabilities are mainstreamed and are provided the least restrictive learning environment. The New London Public Schools also fostered a number of partnerships with area organizations and institutions of higher-education including the U.S Coast Guard Academy, Connecticut College, Mitchell College, Lawrence & Memorial Hospital, the Garde Arts Center, the New London Historical Society, the New London Maritime Custom House, Kente Cultural Center and Centro de la Comunidad.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Connecticut Mastery Test, Fourth Generation, % Goal. The Goal level is more demanding than the Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards.

Grade and CMT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Grade 3 Reading	40.5	59.2	8.8
Writing	46.9	62.7	8.8
Mathematics	45.8	66.5	9.4
Grade 4 Reading	41.3	64.1	6.9
Writing	45.7	65.3	6.9
Mathematics	40.1	68.0	5.0
Grade 5 Reading	38.1	67.6	3.0
Writing	48.3	68.1	7.1
Mathematics	47.5	71.6	5.4
Science	31.8	63.9	3.6
Grade 6 Reading	39.6	74.1	1.8
Writing	32.6	67.4	2.4
Mathematics	26.9	69.3	1.8
Grade 7 Reading	51.1	79.8	2.5
Writing	38.7	65.6	4.3
Mathematics	31.5	68.1	2.5
Grade 8 Reading	48.4	76.8	5.0
Writing	39.1	68.3	4.4
Mathematics	23.3	67.2	3.1
Science	27.4	61.9	5.6

These results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the district at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the district. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

For more detailed CMT results, go to www.ctreports.com.

To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."

Connecticut Academic Performance Test, Third Generation, % Meeting State Goal. The CAPT is administered to Grade 10 students. The Goal level is more demanding than the state Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards. The following results reflect the performance of students with scorable tests who were enrolled in the school at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the school. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

CAPT Subject Area	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Meeting Goal
Reading Across the Disciplines	21.7	47.5	9.0
Writing Across the Disciplines	33.1	63.0	6.7
Mathematics	21.5	49.2	11.3
Science	26.2	47.1	14.2

For more detailed CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com. To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on "No Child Left Behind."

Physical Fitness. The assessment includes tests for flexibility, abdominal strength and endurance, upper-body strength and aerobic endurance.

Physical Fitness: % of Students Reaching Health Standard on All Four Tests	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Percent Reaching Standard
	21.3	50.6	7.3

SAT® I: Reasoning Test Class of 2011		District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Lower Scores
% of Graduates Tested		73.9	77.3	
Average Score	Mathematics	408	505	6.1
	Critical Reading	419	502	6.1
	Writing	401	506	2.3

SAT® I. The lowest possible score on each SAT® I subtest is 200; the highest possible score is 800.

Graduation and Dropout Rates	District	State	% of Districts in State with Equal or Less Desirable Rates
Graduation Rate, Adjusted Cohort Rate 2011	62.6	82.7	6.8
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Grade 9 through 12	3.8	2.6	13.0

Activities of Graduates	District	State
% Pursuing Higher Education (Degree and Non-Degree Programs)	58.2	84.5
% Employed (Civilian Employment and in Armed Services)	3.8	9.7

RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

DISTRICT STAFF

Full-Time Equivalent Count of School Staff	
General Education	
Teachers and Instructors	183.79
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	22.09
Special Education	
Teachers and Instructors	41.33
Paraprofessional Instructional Assistants	30.14
Library/Media Specialists and/or Assistants	4.71
Staff Devoted to Adult Education	5.60
Administrators, Coordinators, and Department Chairs	
District Central Office	7.00
School Level	15.08
Instructional Specialists Who Support Teachers (e.g., subject area specialists)	7.00
Counselors, Social Workers, and School Psychologists	18.60
School Nurses	6.00
Other Staff Providing Non-Instructional Services and Support	157.56

In the full-time equivalent (FTE) count, staff members working part-time in the school district are counted as a fraction of full-time. For example, a teacher who works half-time in the district contributes 0.50 to the district's staff count.

Teachers and Instructors	District	DRG	State
Average Years of Experience in Education	13.0	12.9	13.9
% with Master's Degree or Above	73.2	74.0	79.6

Average Class Size	District	DRG	State
Grade K	16.5	20.9	18.5
Grade 2	23.5	21.5	19.7
Grade 5	24.3	22.7	21.6
Grade 7	20.0	21.2	20.3
High School	21.7	20.0	19.6

Hours of Instruction Per Year*	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School	1,034	1,018	993
Middle School	1,056	1,038	1,024
High School	1,056	1,053	1,024

*State law requires that at least 900 hours of instruction be offered to students in grade 1-12 and full-day kindergarten, and 450 hours to half-day kindergarten students.

Students Per Academic Computer	Dist	DRG	State
Elementary School*	2.2	2.4	2.8
Middle School	1.7	2.2	2.2
High School	3.3	2.0	2.1

*Excludes schools with no grades above kindergarten.

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES, 2010-11

Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources. DRG and state figures will not be comparable to the district if the school district does not teach both elementary and secondary students.

Expenditures All figures are unaudited.	Total (in 1000s)	Expenditures Per Pupil			
		District	PK-12 Districts	DRG	State
Instructional Staff and Services	\$24,985	\$8,133	\$8,464	\$8,966	\$8,469
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$970	\$316	\$267	\$328	\$271
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$1,704	\$555	\$487	\$626	\$482
Student Support Services	\$3,324	\$1,082	\$901	\$788	\$901
Administration and Support Services	\$5,421	\$1,765	\$1,468	\$1,574	\$1,490
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$5,509	\$1,793	\$1,471	\$1,514	\$1,463
Transportation	\$3,305	\$897	\$735	\$921	\$724
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$4,065	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$468	\$152	\$165	\$181	\$165
Total	\$49,751	\$13,505	\$14,238	\$15,277	\$14,140
Additional Expenditures					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$2,607	\$849	\$1,290	\$1,974	\$1,331

Special Education Expenditures	District Total	Percent of PK-12 Expenditures Used for Special Education		
		District	DRG	State
	\$13,996,851	28.1	22.8	21.7

Revenue Sources, % of Expenditures from Source. Revenue sources do not include state funded Teachers' Retirement Board contributions, vocational-technical school operations, SDE budgeted costs for salaries and leadership activities and other state-funded school districts (e.g., Dept. of Children and Families and Dept. of Corrections).

District Expenditures	Local Revenue	State Revenue	Federal Revenue	Tuition & Other
Including School Construction	13.4	72.0	13.7	0.8
Excluding School Construction	34.8	49.9	14.4	0.9

EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES AMONG DISTRICT SCHOOLS

Below is the description submitted by this district of how it allocates resources to insure equity and address needs.

Our district believes that the school budget is the basic mechanism for developing and carrying out its educational plan. We primarily utilize a site-based budgetary process which puts control of the educational dollar where it is spent and where the results will be most obvious. This ensures that each of our students will get the benefits of equal resources. District- and school-level budgets are developed under the umbrella of the District Improvement Plan which focuses on improving student achievement and increasing our graduation rate. School budgets are developed around improving student achievement and school climate. Our budgeting system necessitates that each school in the district establish an individual budget and educational priorities within the confines of the total system. Principals/directors and teachers, working together with input from parents, establish their individual school or program budget within the budgetary parameters established by the BOE. If there are no budgetary parameters, then each principal/director submits a comprehensive budget according to their needs. Projected enrollments are reviewed to assess the need for additional staff within a building. The Director of Business and Finance submits the total budget to the Superintendent and collaboratively they review the various budgets for final submission to the BOE's Finance Committee. The BOE's Finance Committee reviews the Superintendent's recommendations – modifies as they deem appropriate – and submits a final budget to the full Board.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Number of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom the District is Financially Responsible	590
Of All K-12 Students for Whom the District is Financially Responsible, the Percent with Disabilities	17.2%

Of All K-12 Students for Whom District is Financially Responsible, Number and Percentage with Disabilities				
Disability	Count	District Percent	DRG Percent	State Percent
Autism	55	1.6	1.1	1.2
Learning Disability	164	4.8	5.1	3.9
Intellectual Disability	29	0.8	0.8	0.4
Emotional Disturbance	60	1.8	1.4	1.0
Speech Impairment	107	3.1	2.3	2.1
Other Health Impairment*	138	4.0	2.5	2.2
Other Disabilities**	37	1.1	1.3	1.0
Total	590	17.2	14.4	11.7

*Includes chronic health problems such as attention deficit disorders and epilepsy

**Includes hearing, visual, and orthopedic impairments, deaf-blindness, multiple disabilities, traumatic brain injury, and developmental delay

Graduation and Dropout Rates of Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible	District	State
% Who Graduated in 2010-11 with a Standard Diploma	30.0	62.4
2010-11 Annual Dropout Rate for Students Aged 14 to 21	3.9	5.1

STATE ASSESSMENTS

Percent of Students with Disabilities Meeting State Goal. The Goal level is more demanding than the Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards. These results are for students attending district schools who participated in the standard assessment with or without accommodations for their disabilities. Results for fewer than 20 students are not presented.

- **Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT), Fourth Generation.** The CMT reading, writing and mathematics tests are administered to students in Grades 3 through 8, and the CMT science test to students in Grades 5 and 8.
- **Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT), Third Generation.** The CAPT is administered to Grade 10 students.

State Assessment		Students with Disabilities		All Students	
		District	State	District	State
CMT	Reading	10.9	36.0	43.0	70.4
	Writing	9.6	21.5	42.5	66.3
	Mathematics	10.7	31.8	36.6	68.4
	Science	3.4	23.0	29.7	62.9
CAPT	Reading Across the Disciplines	5.6	14.5	21.7	47.5
	Writing Across the Disciplines	11.1	18.2	33.1	63.0
	Mathematics	11.1	15.4	21.5	49.2
	Science	11.1	13.6	26.2	47.1

For more detailed CMT or CAPT results, go to www.ctreports.com. To see the NCLB Report Card for this school, go to www.sde.ct.gov and click on “No Child Left Behind.”

Participation in State Assessments of Students with Disabilities Attending District Schools

CMT	% Without Accommodations	41.4
	% With Accommodations	58.6
CAPT	% Without Accommodations	28.6
	% With Accommodations	71.4
% Assessed Using Skills Checklist		8.4

Accommodations for a student's disability may be made to allow him or her to participate in testing. Students whose disabilities prevent them from taking the test even with accommodations are assessed by means of a list of skills aligned to the same content and grade level standards as the CMT and CAPT.

Federal law requires that students with disabilities be educated with their non-disabled peers as much as is appropriate. Placement in separate educational facilities tends to reduce the chances of students with disabilities interacting with non-disabled peers, and of receiving the same education.

K-12 Students with Disabilities Placed in Educational Settings Other Than This District's Schools

Placement	Count	Percent
Public Schools in Other Districts	70	11.9
Private Schools or Other Settings	52	8.8

Number and Percentage of K-12 Students with Disabilities for Whom District is Financially Responsible by the Percentage of Time They Spent with Their Non-Disabled Peers

Time Spent with Non-Disabled Peers	Count of Students	Percent of Students		
		District	DRG	State
79.1 to 100 Percent of Time	386	65.4	67.1	72.1
40.1 to 79.0 Percent of Time	90	15.3	17.2	16.3
0.0 to 40.0 Percent of Time	114	19.3	15.7	11.7

SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND ACTIVITIES

The following narrative was submitted by this district.

In 2011-2012 curriculum committees continued to review and update curricula. Teachers and parents have become acclimated to the standards based report cards for grades K-5. Professional Learning Communities in grades K-5 focused on developing strategies among elementary teachers on how to more effectively teach mathematics and literacy. Our revised Teacher Evaluation Plan, which focuses on defining and developing effective instructional practices and is linked to student achievement outcomes, has been fully implemented. The district data team, DELTA met twice a month. This team wrote and made revisions to the District Improvement Plan. At the building level Data Teams have been established to use formative and summative data to regularly monitor and measure their professional practices and their impact on student learning. The district also had many partners who worked directly with staff at the building level to develop School Improvement Plans and further develop the effectiveness of data teams.
